HIGH LEVEL MANAGEMENT ALTERNATIVE

The High Level Management Alternative refers to a higher level of BLM management and involvement than the Continuation of Existing or Low Level Management Alternatives. Depending on the specific issue, high level would mean more restrictions on development and would provide a greater degree of protection and enhancement of resource values.

Grazing Management

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

The resource objective for "I" allotments would be to improve poor and fair range condition to fair and good range condition through implementation of improved grazing management and vegetative manipulation practices. Because of topography, soil limitations and wildlife habitat concerns, it isn't feasible to strive for 100% improvement on all poor and fair condition range. As a general guide, AMPs developed under this alternative would be designed to achieve 80% good condition on key livestock use areas (key areas being defined as drainage bottoms and flatter areas that normally receive at least moderate use and have the capability to respond to grazing treatments or vegetative manipulation practices).

The objective for "M" allotments, where it's economically advantageous to do so, would be to improve range condition and increase forage production through vegetative manipulation and prescribed grazing treatments while maintaining current satisfactory condition on the remaining "M" allotments.

The objective for "C" category allotments would be to continue custodial management.

The livestock production objective would be to maintain current proper use allocations in the short term, while increasing potentially available livestock forage in the "I" allotments and selected "M" allotments. Where current allocations exceed proper use, the objective would be to determine the proper use level through monitoring and allocate livestock forage accordingly.

Table 2.1 shows the recommended methods and treatments for allotments considered in this alternative as well as the management objectives for each "I" allotment.

Proposed Allocation

In this alternative, 62,437 AUM authorizations to 333 operators would continue in the short term. Intensive monitoring of actual livestock use and forage utilization would be conducted on the Dryhead and Upper Sage Creek allotments to determine proper stocking levels. Less intensive monitoring of stocking levels would be done on the remaining "I", "M" and "C" allotments. Any reductions in livestock use would be phased in over a 5 year period, according to BLM grazing regulations.

In the long term, it's assumed that increased forage, available under proper use, would be allocated to livestock. This increase is estimated to be 10,711 AUMs.

Grazing Treatments and Systems

Sixteen new AMPs would be developed on "I" category allotments and six existing AMPs in the "I" category would be revised. Allotment-specific objectives would be developed to resolve resource conflicts and improve resource conditions on these "I" allotments. Grazing systems incorporating rest and deferment treatments would be designed to achieve these objectives. A total of 87,679 acres, of which 43,114 are in fair and poor range condition, would have improved grazing systems. Current grazing systems in 18 "M" category existing AMPs would be continued. Table 2.2 summarizes the proposed management in this alternative.

Proposed Range Improvements

In this alternative, 21,520 acres of dense sagebrush would be burned, 1,700 acres dominated by blue grama and fringed sagewort would be chiseled or disced and 5,118 acres of crested wheatgrass would be hayed or mechanically treated to increase forage production, improve range conditions and reduce erosion.

Structural improvements would include: 16 reservoirs, 10 wells, 2 spring developments, 31 miles of stockwater pipelines, 47 water catchments and 46 miles of fence. Water catchments, although costly, would also benefit some wildlife species. The cost estimates for these improvements are in Appendix 2.1.

A coordinated noxious weed program among BLM, local weed boards and landowners would be pursued in this alternative. The amount of acreage controlled would depend on the amount of cooperation of other landowners and weed control agencies. An accurate inventory of infested acres is needed. Since so many factors are involved that limit a meaningful estimate of acreage sprayed in this alternative, it's assumed for this analysis that only the current control program (45 acres) in the Paradise Allotment would be accomplished in the short term. Cost of this program would be $15,000 as explained in the Continuation of Existing Management Alternative.

The total cost of the improvements in this alternative would be $995,725 (see Appendix 2.1 for summary of current costs for each type of improvement).

Monitoring

Monitoring would vary with management category (see Table 2.2). Permanent trend studies are located in 67 allotments and monitoring would continue, with the 22 "I" allotments receiving the greatest emphasis. Actual livestock use and utilization data would be collected on "I" allotments where there is a need to closely monitor the level of livestock use.

Wild Horse Management

This alternative would involve water development, cross fencing and boundary fencing of herd areas.

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

The resource objectives of this alternative are: to maintain 2,775 acres that currently are in good range condition; to provide for good range condition on 50-60% of the grazable range sites within 25 years; and to prevent further deterioration of range sites which are in less than satisfactory condition.

The bands of wild horses within a herd area would be encouraged to move from pasture to pasture by control of access to water or by forced movement to achieve desired objectives for vegetation, watershed, wildlife and recreation.

Populations of wild horses within a herd area would be limited to a number of animals that would not exceed the average acceptable utilization by weight, of the key forage species. This would be 55% utilization on bluebunch wheatgrass, Idaho fescue and needleandthread under a deferred or rest rotation grazing system, and 45% under seasonal rotation (a natural rotation based on changes in range readiness because of elevation differences). When the determined average utilization on the key species is reached, the wild horses would be forced to move to another pasture.

The initial population of wild horses would be the same as in the Continuation of Existing Management Alternative. This population figure is the total number of horses on the range at the beginning of the winter grazing season. Approximately 80% of this total will be horses 2 years old or older. During the short term, this level would be maintained in each of the herd areas. The assumption is that range condition and production would gradually improve and that over the long term (25 years) the number of horses would be allowed to increase. It is anticipated the PMWHR may support up to 179 wild horses when in good range condition and under a rest rotation or deferred rotation grazing system.

When it's necessary to reduce the population of a herd area, wild horses would be relocated to other herd areas, if those areas would tolerate the increase. In absence of relocation opportunities, excess wild horses would be processed for adoption or disposed of on the range.

A selective excess program would retain only those wild horses with the conformation, color and breeding (genetic) characteristics of the Pryor Mountain wild horses.

In order to fully implement this alternative, the Bureau of Land Management should acquire all non-Federal holdings now being grazed by the wild horses. This would provide management stability in the future.

Implementation of this alternative would also require altering the current sex ratio so that it's heavy to studs to reduce the foal crop and minimize the need for excessing wild horses.

Proposed Range Improvements

This alternative would require installing approximately 7 or 8 water catchments, 10 to 14 miles of interior cross fences and about 5 miles of exterior boundary fence. The cost of installing these improvements is estimated to be $106,000.

In the short term, the annual excessing of horses would continue, requiring an estimated $21,000 annually to gather and excess an average of 30 horses. In the long term, altering the sex ratio would reduce the foal crop, but some level of annual excessing may still be required. Costs in the long term cannot be estimated because a time estimate of when the sex ratio reversal and its impacts to horse numbers would take effect has not been established.

Monitoring

Wild horse studies would include the population size, distribution by herd area and population characteristics such as sex ratio, age structure, social structure and animal condition.

Habitat studies would focus on range utilization, condition and trend studies and vegetative cover. These studies would be conducted on key range sites in each herd area and would be used as a basis for adjusting the population levels in each herd area.

Wildlife Management

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 chartered BLM with the responsibility of maintaining or enhancing fish and wildlife habitats that occur on the public lands.

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

The Billings Resource Area operates under a number of general wildlife habitat management objectives which are utilized Bureau-wide. Each objective is mandated and/or supported by specific Federal regulation or legislation. These wildlife program objectives are common to each alternative level discussed in this RMP/EIS. The BLM wildlife habitat management program places special emphasis on, but is not limited to the protection, maintenance and enhancement of:

— Crucial habitats for big game, upland game birds and waterfowl.

— Crucial habitats for nongame species of special interest and concern to state or other Federal agencies.

— Wetland and riparian habitats.

— Existing or potential fisheries habitat.

— Habitat for state or federally listed threatened and/or endangered species.

These commitments to the wildlife resources vary by alternative only in the level of effort devoted to each element within the program. The level of effort undertaken annually is dependent upon national priorities, Washington Office direction and the availability of funding and manpower to effectively complete the workload.

The level and intensity of wildlife habitat management activities presented in this alternative have been selected based on feasibility, opportunity, need and associated impacts to other resource programs.

Wildlife Improvements

An intensive project development program would be initiated, for total implementation to be completed by the end of the short-term period. This would entail the installation of 20 upland bird watering devices in areas where high value habitat is not being utilized due to the lack of available watering sources. Fifty waterfowl nesting islands would be constructed in existing reservoirs in Musselshell and Yellowstone Counties. This would provide nesting and production opportunities on approximately 20% of the total existing reservoirs. Seven existing reservoirs would be fenced to achieve desirable aquatic habitat for waterfowl and shore birds where livestock management options are limited. Of the seven, three reservoirs would be fenced completely with alternate watering facilities installed and the upper 1/3 of the other four reservoirs would be fenced including approximately 50 acres of upland habitat for each reservoir. Twenty-five acres of dense nesting cover would be planted at Big Lake to promote waterfowl production in an area not currently utilized. Twenty raptor nest sites would be installed on 10 active prairie dog colonies and selected locations along the Yellowstone River where abundant prey sources are not being utilized to their potential and/or there is a lack of available nesting sites. If suitable sites are located, three fisheries reservoirs would be constructed near urban communities to help meet the growing demand for these wildlife and recreational resources. Through the use of acceptable grazing systems, 80% of the woody floodplain type of vegetation composition, totalling approximately 41 miles within the category "I" allotments, would be maintained or improved to good or excellent range condition. This objective is consistent with the objectives stated in the High Level Management Alternative for grazing management in this EIS.

Maintenance of the existing facilities would receive priority for available funding over the construction of the proposed project developments.

Habitat Management Plans

Efforts would be focused on the development of habitat management plans for chukar partridge, waterfowl and fisheries. These species have been selected due to their uniqueness in the resource area, obvious opportunities for enhancement or public demands for increased availability.

Land Acquisition

A program to identify a limited amount of non-Bureau lands desirable for fish and wildlife habitat would be initiated. Attention would be focused on lands which contain desirable waterfowl nesting areas, big game wintering ranges, high value upland game bird habitat, active and/or potential fisheries habitat and important nongame and threatened and endangered species habitats. Future acquisition of these lands would occur predominantly through land exchanges.

Monitoring

To achieve the wildlife objective, the wildlife program would focus its emphasis on completing 100,000 acres of terrestrial habitat monitoring annually. This level of monitoring would provide a continuing data base of habitat condition in all big game winter concentration areas, upland game bird nesting areas and PMWHR. Attention would also be focused on the 24 implemented AMPs and selected category "I" and "M" allotments where potential conflicts may occur. Surveys would be conducted on 12 selected waterfowl concentration areas to collect utilization and average annual brood numbers. Approximately 500 acres of known prairie dog colonies would be surveyed for the occurrence of black-footed ferrets and mapped to establish average annual expansion data. Approximately 10 miles of streams with active fisheries would be surveyed per year to collect species occurrence and habitat condition data. Five reservoirs with fisheries potential would be surveyed annually to provide suitability data for future stockings.

Coordination

All major wildlife habitat enhancement projects will be coordinated with regional personnel of the MDFWP. As mandated in a joint memorandum of understanding with the MDFWP, all projects involving vegetative manipulation will be presented to the regional personnel for comments and recommendations in advance of project initiation.

Informal and formal consultation with USFWS will be initiated on all proposed actions in which BLM determines a may affect situation exists for any Federally listed threatened or endangered species. Consultation will be done in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, as amended.

An interagency team of wildlife biologists has been established to review and make final recommendations on the application of the Federal coal program wildlife unsuitability criteria for the Bull Mountain area. This effort will be accomplished in consultation with USFWS and MDFWP.

Implementation Costs

It is estimated that the total cost of improvements to implement this alternative is $102,500 (see Appendix 2.2 for a summary of estimated costs for each type of improvement).

Timber Management

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

As in the Continuation of Existing Management Alternative, small sales to meet local demand and to salvage fire damaged or bug-killed timber would be permitted. An annual cut of 45 MBF, over 20 acres would occur. In the short term, 360 MBF on 160 acres would be harvested. In the long term, 1,125 MBF would be harvested on 500 acres. A total of 15,607 acres of forested lands would

be protected from cutting except to benefit other resource values or concerns such as watershed, safety and wildlife. Of this total, 5,312 acres are productive forest lands. The protection areas include the Twin Coulee and Pryor Mountain WSAs, as well as Bad Canyon, Young's Point, Hamilton's (Asparagus) Point, Acton area and the Shepherd Ah-Nei area.

Coal

The two potential coal mines (150,000 and 300,000 tons) described in the Low Level Management Alternative would be projected for this alternative as well.

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

The 9,360 acres of Federal coal in the Bull Mountains found acceptable for further consideration pending further study would be reduced under this alternative by a more stringent multiple use trade-off analysis. Locally important resource values such as agricultural productivity, groundwater resources, wildlife habitat, recreation, visual resources, social and economic conditions would be given more weight and coal would be deleted where such values are found to have an overriding importance. These considerations would result in somewhat less acreage being found acceptable for further consideration than in the Low Level Management Alternative. (See Figures 2.1 and 2.2.)

All coal to be mined by underground methods is suitable for further consideration for leasing or exchange. The BLM would not apply coal unsuitability criteria to these areas until a site-specific mine plan is filed, detailing the proposed location of surface facilities.

Coal exchanges would be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Oil and Gas Leasing

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

Important resource values would be protected from degradation caused by oil and gas exploration and development. Oil and gas leases would be issued, however, activities would be restricted when they conflict with sensitive resource values or other management objectives.

Known sensitive areas include: PMWHR (which includes one WSA and two WSUs); the Twin Coulee WSA; Steamboat Butte; Castle Butte; Weatherman's Draw; Crooked Creek Natural Area; Bridger Fossil Area; Red Dome; Petroglyph Canyon; Red Valley; Hamilton's (Asparagus) Point; the Bad Canyon area; the Young's Point area; the Shepherd Ah-Nei area; the Acton area; Federal minerals within 2 miles of the Yellowstone River; and public lands along the face of the Beartooth Mountains (see Appendix 2.6 and Map Pocket Overlay). These areas encompass 70,000 acres of Federal surface and/or mineral estate. New areas may be identified as required by changing policy or as increased information becomes available.

Land Tenure Adjustment

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

The resource objective of this proposed action is to adjust the resource area land and/or mineral base using various Bureau authorities (exchanges, sales, Recreation and Public Purpose patents, etc.) in order to improve management of both public and private land.

Public response to the Draft EIS proposal for Land Tenure Adjustment was unanimous in support of the resource area's use of land exchanges to acquire tracts or block up public land with greater public access, recreation, wildlife habitat, or other resource values. The public responses were generally opposed to disposal of public lands by direct sale. Some concern was expressed regarding the effects of land disposal on surrounding landowners and grazing permittees.

The draft RMP/EIS identified 5,237 acres of public land as suitable for disposal within the Land Tenure Adjustment Area. Within the same area, 3,622 acres were identified as suitable for exchange. Following public comments, the resource area staff reevaluated 19 tracts of public land previously identified for disposal. This evaluation reduced the total acreage in the disposal category from 5,237 to 3,837 acres. (See Appendix 2.7.)

In the light of public responses and further clarfication of land tenure policy at the national and state levels, land exchange would be the predominant method of land adjustment and/or disposal. This adjustment in the proposed action makes the 3,837 acres of public land categorized for disposal within the Land Tenure Adjustment Area available for disposal by exchange as well as by sale or other authorized methods of disposal. Public land in the Land Tenure Adjustment Area available for exchange now totals 7,459 acres.

Twenty-six thousand three hundred and fourteen (26,314) acres within the Land Tenure Adjustment Area have been categorized for retention.

Two thousand three hundred and eighty-two acres of public land have been categorized for further study. Lands placed in this category would be later evaluated using the criteria defined in the State Director Guidance for Resource Management Planning in Montana and the Dakotas (Appendix 1.6).

It should be noted that land base adjustment is a tiered process involving two entirely separate and distinct actions—categorization and disposal. Categorization involves the application of certain criteria to a given tract or zone of public land for initial identification of the potential for disposal or retention. This streamlines the land tenure adjustment process by helping the resource area to focus on those lands which initially meet the disposal criteria outlined in the Draft EIS (Appendix 1.3) and in the State Director Guidance (see Appendix 1.6).

Actual disposal by either sale or exchange requires a site-specific analysis prior to the recommendation. The analysis is handled in subsequent activity planning through the Environmental Assessment/Land Report (EA/LR). The EA/LR is an interdisciplinary document

which examines and evaluates the effect of the proposed action on all affected resource values, which could include vegetation, watershed, wildlife, recreation, aesthetics, air quality, cultural resources, public access and the social and economic impact to adjacent landowners, grazing permittees and the local community.

Section 206(a) of FLPMA requires that land exchanges serve the public interest. This section of FLPMA states that an exchange may occur if "the values and objectives which Federal lands or interests to be conveyed may serve if retained in Federal ownership are not more than the values of the non-Federal lands or interests and the public objectives they could serve if acquired".

Likewise, public lands to be disposed of by sale must meet certain FLPMA requirements. Section 203(a) of FLPMA states that public lands may be sold if:

1. such tract because of its location or other characteristics is difficult and uneconomic to manage as part of the public lands, and is not suitable for management by another Federal department or agency; or
2. such tract was acquired for a specific purpose and the tract is no longer required for that or any other Federal purpose; or
3. disposal of such tract will serve important public objectives, including but not limited to, expansion of communities and economic development, which cannot be achieved prudently or feasibly on land other than public land and which outweigh other public objectives and values, including, but not limited to, recreation and scenic values, which would be served by maintaining such tract in Federal ownership.

In summary, before a proposed exchange or sale of public land can proceed, the EA/LR must show that the proposed action accrues significant benefit to the public.

When EA/LR findings are such that a public land parcel can be disposed of either by exchange or sale, and management concurs, a Notice of Realty Action (NORA) is published once in the Federal Register and at least once a week for three weeks in a newspaper with distribution in the area of the proposed action. The NORA describes the proposed action and specifies a 45 day period for public review and comment. The location of the office where individuals can review the case file is also included. Following the 45 day period, any adverse comments are responded to by the District and/or State Director, who may vacate or modify the proposed action based on the comments received.

In addition to the official publication of the NORA in local papers and the Federal Register, adjacent landowners, Governor, Congressional delegation, county commissioners, and other interested parties are sent a letter of notification with a copy of the NORA attached. If the county commissioners feel it is necessary, a public hearing on the proposed action would also be held.

Several individuals expressed a concern about how the retention and disposal criteria would be applied to the uncategorized lands outside of the Land Tenure Adjustment Area. To address this concern, the resource area staff has delineated the remaining portion of the resource area into retention and disposal zones (see Overlay Map Pocket). Approximately 364,350 acres were delineated in Retention Zones, while approximately 52,500 acres were delineated in Disposal Zones outside of the initial Land Tenure Adjustment Area described in the draft EIS. The lands in the disposal zones include approximately 10,150 acres of public land adjacent to U.S. Forest Service land along the Beartooth Face and in the Twin Coulee WSA that would be proposed for exchange to the U.S. Forest Service. These tracts of public land would thus remain in public ownership. The remaining 42,350 acres of public land in the Disposal Zones would be suitable for disposal by any method, but predominantly through exchange (see Table 2.4).

Existing data and an interdisciplinary analysis were utilized in delineating the boundaries of the zones (retention, disposal, further study). Specific tracts within these zones may be readjusted or recategorized as a result of site specific analysis during the activity planning stage.

Exchanges would also be the predominant method of land disposal for public lands outside of the Land Tenure Adjustment Area. Lands to be acquired by exchange will generally be located within retention areas, while lands to be disposed of by exchange or sale will primarily be located in disposal areas. Based on site-specific application of the land tenure adjustment criteria in the State Director Guidance, some lands within a disposal zone, such as critical wildlife habitat, may be retained, while some lands in a retention zone may be disposed of.

Lands to be acquired should:

1. facilitate access to public land,
2. maintain or enhance important public values and uses,
3. maintain or enhance local social and economic values,
4. facilitate implementation of other aspects of the Billings RMP, including:
   A. acquisition of non-BLM lands within PMWHR,
   B. facilitation of future mineral development, and/or
5. facilitate other criteria addressed in the State Director Guidance.

Classifications

Under the Classification and Multiple Use Act of 1964, three areas were classified for retention. They were also segregated from appropriation under the agricultural land laws, from sales under Section 2455 of the Revised Statutes, and from the operation of the mining laws but not from mineral leasing.

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

The High Level Management objective is to protect approximately 28,586 acres with sensitive resource values against mineral entry within PMWHR. A protective withdrawal would be sought for the areas now classified under the C&MU Act. This would segregate the area against mineral entry.

Recreation Access

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

The resource area would provide access into areas with high recreation potential, and where the public or state and Federal agencies have identified the need for access.

The BLM would acquire an exclusive easement or right-of-way to the following areas: a large tract of public land on the north side of the Yellowstone River and 7 miles west of Pompeys Pillar (in Sections 6, 7 and 18, T. 3 N., R. 29 E.); an area 6 miles north of Laurel (in Section 14, T. 1 S., R. 23 E.); an area in the Bridger, Belfry, Warren Triangle (in T. 8 S.; T. 9 S, R. 23 E.); Young's Point (in Sections 4, 5, 8 and 9, T. 3 S., R. 22 E.); Bad Canyon (in Sections 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13 and 14, T. 4 S., R. 16 E.); and the west end of Red Pryor Mountain (access on the Inferno Canyon, Water Canyon, Timber Canyon and Bear Springs roads). Access would be sought to public lands adjacent to the Yellowstone, Musselshell, Boulder, Stillwater, Clarks Fork and Bighorn Rivers. In addition, tracts consisting of 10 to 100 acres along the Yellowstone River would be acquired by the BLM for floating access near Big Timber, Springtime and Pompeys Pillar, Montana.

Off-Road Vehicle Use

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

The objective of this alternative is to protect most public lands in the resource area from damage caused by ORV use, and to reduce conflicts between resource users, yet provide areas for their enjoyment. The following measures would be taken:

Off-road vehicle use in the Hamilton's (Asparagus) Point area would be closed except for the main access road and parking area.

An area east of the county road (approximately 460 acres) running through the Shepherd Ah-Nei area would be designated as limited to authorized use. Authorized use would be by permit or license and would be restricted to persons holding grazing leases, to BLM employees for the purpose of resource management and other similar types of authorization. Off-road vehicle use west of the county road (approximately 3,090 acres) would be limited to designated roads and trails and authorized use. The southern portion (about 512 acres) would be open to ORV use.

In the South Hills, the 70 acre area would be permanently closed to all vehicle use and the rest of the area (1,200 acres) would be closed to 4-wheeled vehicles (see Figure 2.4).

The ORV use in northern Musselshell County and the Bridger Triangle Area, encompassing approximately 84,000 acres, would be limited to existing roads, trails and authorized use. All other areas would not be designated unless new conflicts or resource damage occurs.

If legal access is obtained to the area 7 miles west of Pompeys Pillar and Young's Point (see Recreation Access description, this alternative), ORV use may be limited to designated roads or trails. Other restrictions would be the same as described in the Continuation of Existing Management Alternative.

Environmental Education

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

The BLM would provide one or more environmental education sites for use by local school districts, depending on the demand. The three existing facilities at the Shepherd Ah-Nei site would be maintained. The Acton area would be developed should use at the Shepherd site exceed the carrying capacity of 6,000 user days (BLM, 1982), or if the schools express interest in developing this area. Other multiple use activities would be restricted if they conflict with environmental education.

Wild Horse Interpretation

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

The BLM would construct and maintain six roadside signs around the horse range boundary to provide for continued interpretation of the PMWHR. An interpretive overlook would also be constructed at a cost of approximately $100,000 to provide additional interpretation of wild horses and management of the horse range. Facilities would include an interpretive overlook (20' X 40') located on the periphery of the horse range (1 mile or less from an existing road, but outside the WSA boundaries); approximately 1 mile of hard surfaced road; a 20-vehicle parking area; foot trails; and 2 comfort stations.

Wilderness

Resource Objectives and Recommendations

Under this alternative, four areas containing 32,302 acres would be recommended as suitable for designation as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System (see Figures 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, and 2.9). If Congress selects this "all wilderness" alternative, the resource objective would be to manage these areas for their natural and primitive recreational values allowing other resource use only when that use would not cause any damage to, or loss of, wilderness values.

TABLE 2.5: SUMMARY DATA FOR FOUR ALTERNATIVES

GRAZING MANAGEMENT

Resource Proposals		Proposed Action		Continuation of Existing Management		Low Level Management		High Level Management	
Type of AMP	Category	No.	Acres	No.	Acres	No.	Acres	No.	Acres
Revised	"I"	6	46,486	6	46,486	6	46,486	6	46,486
Existing	"M"	16	65,590	16	65,590	16	65,590	16	65,590
Existing	"C"	2	42,553	2	42,553	2	42,553	2	42,553
New	"I"	16	41,193	16	41,193	16	41,193	16	41,193
Non-AMP	"M"	140	144,634	140	144,634	140	144,634	140	144,634
Non-AMP	"C"	213	58,932	213	58,932	213	58,932	213	58,932
TOTAL		393	399,388	393	399,388	393	399,388	393	399,388
Unallotted (acres)		5,146		5,146		5,146		5,146	
Livestock Allocations		AUMs		AUMs		AUMs		AUMs	
Initial		62,437		62,437		59,816		62,437	
Long Term		73,148		65,557		62,037		73,148	
Range Improvements		Amounts		Amounts		Amounts		Amounts	
Structural									
Reservoirs (#'s)		16		4		0		16	
Spring Developments (#'s)		2		0		0		2	
Water Catchments (#'s)		47		19		0		47	
Wells (#'s)		10		9		0		10	
Pipelines (miles)		31		21		0		31	
Fences (miles)		46		13		0		46	
Cattle Guards (1)									
Nonstructural									
Mechanical (acres)		6,818		0		0		6,818	
Burning (acres)		21,520		0		0		21,520	
Spraying (acres) (annually)		45		45		0		45	

(1) Cattle guards would be installed when required where fence lines intersect roads; however, the number is not known at this time.

TABLE 2.5: SUMMARY DATA FOR FOUR ALTERNATIVES (cont.)

WILD HORSE MANAGEMENT

Resource Proposals	Proposed Action	Continuation of Existing Management	Low Level Management	High Level Management
Estimated Horse Population				
Initial	121	121	130	121
Long Term	(3)	121	(2)	179
Structural Improvements				
Fences (miles)	7	7	5	15-19
Water Sources (#'s)	5	5	10	7-8
Horse Traps (#'s)	8	8	0	8
Acquisition of Nonpublic Lands	2,240	0	0	2,240
Acres Under Grazing Treatment	44,296(1)	0	0	44,296 (1)
Acres Available for Wild Horse Grazing	44,296 (1)	44,296 (1)	36,600 (4)	44,296 (1)

(1) Includes all public, state and private lands.

(2) Due to a drastic reduction in ecological range condition, the carrying capacity of the horse range may be reduced to nearly 0; however, interbreeding, poor health and disease may drastically reduce the horse herd even if some forage remains. For this reason, horse population numbers are not estimated.

(3) A slow increase in range condition will occur in the long term, but due to fragile soils, low precipitation and no rest rotation grazing system being utilized, increases in available forage for horses would be minimal.

(4) Includes designated PMWHR only.

TABLE 2.5: SUMMARY DATA FOR FOUR ALTERNATIVES (cont.)

WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

Resource Proposals	Proposed Action	Continuation of Existing Management	Low Level Management	High Level Management
Surveys & Monitoring Per Year				
Terrestrial Habitat (acres)	60,000	50,000	40,000	100,000
Waterfowl (reservoirs)	12	7	0	12
Prairie Dog Towns (acres)	300	300	0	500
Streams (miles)	10	5	0	10
Reservoirs (each)	3	2	0	5
HMPs (#'s)				
Waterfowl	0	0	0	1
Chukar	1	0	0	1
Fish	0	0	0	1
Structural Improvements (#'s)				
Water Catchments	5	12	0	20
Waterfowl Islands	50	20	0	50
Reservoir Fencing	7	7	0	7
Raptor Nests	20	0	0	20
Fish Ponds	3	0	0	3
Riparian Zone Fencing (acres)	0	10	0	0
Nonstructural Improvements				
Woody Floodplain Zone (miles)	41 (1)	0	0	41 (1)
Nesting Cover Planting (acres)	25	0	0	25

(1) Improve or maintain 80% of 41 miles in "I" allotments to good or excellent ecological range condition in the long term.

TABLE 2.5: SUMMARY DATA FOR FOUR ALTERNATIVES (cont.)

TIMBER MANAGEMENT

Resource Proposals	Proposed Action	Continuation of Existing Management	Low Level Management	High Level Management
Annual Cut (MBF)	70	45	90	45
Protected Areas (acres) (1)	9,500	14,457	217	15,607

(1) Exclusive of wilderness areas. These figures also include productive and non-productive forested areas.

COAL

Resource Proposals	Proposed Action	Continuation of Existing Management	Low Level Management	High Level Management
Annual Production (ton/year)				
Surface Mining				
Short Term	10,000 (1)(3)	10,000	10,000 (1)(3)	10,000 (1)(3)
Long Term	300,000	10,000 (1)	300,000	300,000
Underground Mining				
1984-86	0	0 (2)	0	0
1987	30,000 (3)	0 (2)	30,000 (3)	30,000 (3)
1988-2009	150,000	0 (2)	150,000	150,000

(1) Current production would be maintained under emergency lease procedures.
(2) No underground mining at present.
(3) Assuming surface mining operations will not begin for 12 years; underground mining to begin by 1987.

OIL & GAS LEASING

Resource Proposals	Proposed Action	Continuation of Existing Management	Low Level Management	High Level Management
Acres in No-Lease Category	(2)	0	0	0
Acres Leased With Special Stipulations	70,000	49,870	0	70,000 (1)
Acres Leased With Standard Stipulations	579,443	599,573	649,443	579,443

(1) This area encompasses the Twin Coulee WSA, PMWHR, Beartooth Face, Young's Point, Hamilton's (Asparagus) Point, Bad Canyon, Steamboat Butte, Castle Butte, Weatherman's Draw, Crooked Creek Natural Area, Bridger Fossil Area, Red Dome, Red Valley, Petroglyph Canyon, Shepherd Ah-Nei, Acton area and Federal minerals within 2 miles of the Yellowstone River. New areas will be delineated where application of special stipulations is necessary.
(2) There is a strong probability that some areas will not be leased; acreage cannot be quantified at this time.

TABLE 2.5: SUMMARY DATA FOR FOUR ALTERNATIVES (cont.)

LAND TENURE ADJUSTMENT

Resource Proposals	Proposed Action	Continuation of Existing Management	Low Level Management	High Level Management
Inside Land Tenure Adjustment Area:				
Acres Found Suitable for Disposal (1)	7,459 (3)	(2)	0	7,459 (3)
Acres Recommended for Retention	26,315	36,156	36,156	26,315
Acres Recommended for Further Study	2,382	0	0	2,382
Outside Land Tenure Adjustment Area:				
Approximate Disposal Acreage	52,500 (3)	0	0	52,500 (3)
Approximate Retention Acreage	364,350	416,850	416,850	364,350

(1) Land exchange will be the predominant method of disposal.
(2) Projected acreage based on acreage sold or exchanged in the last 10 years (1,142 acres short term; 3,570 acres long term).
(3) Includes approximately 10,150 acres suitable for exchange to the U.S. Forest Service.

CLASSIFICATIONS

Resource Proposals	Proposed Action	Continuation of Existing Management	Low Level Management	High Level Management
Acres Segregated from Mineral Entry	980	28,586	0	28,586

RECREATION ACCESS

Resource Proposals	Proposed Action	Continuation of Existing Management	Low Level Management	High Level Management
Number of Sites to be Acquired	7	0	0	10

OFF-ROAD VEHICLE USE

Resource Proposals	Proposed Action	Continuation of Existing Management	Low Level Management	High Level Management
Acres Limited	57,830	55,800	55,800	139,800
Acres Closed	70	70	70	70
Additional Roads Closed (miles)	3	0	0	2
Additional Roads Open (miles)	9	0	13	0

TABLE 2.5: SUMMARY DATA FOR FOUR ALTERNATIVES (cont.)

ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

Resource Proposals	Proposed Action	Continuation of Existing Management	Low Level Management	High Level Management
Number of Acres	77-0-133 (1)	77	0	133

(1) Assume 77 acres maintained pending no vandalism and 133 acres if visitation exceeds 6,000 visitors/year on 77 acre site.

WILD HORSE INTERPRETATION

Resource Proposals	Proposed Action	Continuation of Existing Management	Low Level Management	High Level Management
Acres Disturbed	0	0	0	10
Number of Signs	6	3	3	6
Miles of Road Constructed	0	0	0	1

WILDERNESS

Resource Proposals	Proposed Action	Continuation of Existing Management	Low Level Management	High Level Management
Suitability Recommendations in Acres by Study Units/Areas				
Twin Coulee				
Suitable	0	0	0	6,870
Nonsuitable	6,870	6,870	6,870	0
Pryor Mountain				
Suitable	16,927	0	0	16,927
Nonsuitable	0	16,927	16,927	0
Burnt Timber Canyon				
Suitable	3,430	0	0	3,955
Nonsuitable	525	3,955	3,955	0
Bighorn Tack-On				
Suitable	2,550	0	0	4,550
Nonsuitable	2,000	4,550	4,550	0
Total				
Suitable	22,907	0	0	32,302
Nonsuitable	9,395	32,302	32,302	0

(1) No Wilderness Alternative.
(2) All Wilderness Alternative.
(3) Partial Wilderness Alternative.

Source: BLM, 1982